ECCLESIA LAW

# THE AGENT FOR THE BIRTH CERTIFICATE CONSTRUCT ET AL THE PERSON - CITIZEN BANKRUPTCY TRUSTEE MISSUNDERSTANDINGS

14TH April 2026

The contemporary global governance framework is predicated upon a sophisticated and largely invisible bifurcation between biological reality and juridical construction. This division is not merely a procedural nuance but the foundational ontological bedrock upon which the entire edifice of civil governance and global commerce rests. At the heart of this system lies the distinction between the natural person—the living, breathing human being capable of moral agency and sensory experience—and the artificial person, a legal fiction or construct created by statute to serve as a vessel for rights, duties, and liabilities within a digital and worldwide commercial grid.[1] To navigate this landscape effectively, one must comprehend the mechanism that bridges the chasm between the biological and the legal: the Law of Agency. It is through agency that the intangible entity known as the birth certificate construct interacts with the material world, and conversely, it is through agency that the living man or woman is bound to the liabilities and obligations of that artificial construct.[1]

The "birth certificate construct" is not merely a record of vital statistics; it represents the creation of a "body corporate" or "decedent estate" that serves as a "Player Piece" on the "Monopoly Board of Commerce".[1] A critical misunderstanding within various status-correction movements involves the strategy of claiming that the living man or woman is a "de facto trustee" of this construct. This report provides a rigorous technical analysis of why such a strategy is fundamentally flawed, explaining the mechanics of the "Agency Trap" and the structural implications of the 1933 commercial bankruptcy. By examining the doctrine of *executor de son tort* and the reality of agency law, this analysis demonstrates that the living individual is typically dragged into the bankruptcy of the construct as its presumed agent and surety, and that claiming trustee status only reinforces this jurisdictional captivity.[1]

## The Ontology of the Artificial Person and the Corporate Veil

To understand the mechanics of the relationship between the natural and the artificial, one must first ground the analysis in the orthodox principles of English law regarding personality. The legal system, by its very nature, does not interact with biological matter; it interacts with "persons," a term of art meticulously defined by statute and case law to act as an interface layer between the state and the subject.[1] The foundation of modern statutory interpretation in the United Kingdom—and by extension, in jurisdictions derived from English common law—is the Interpretation Act 1978. This Act provides the

hermeneutical key for reading all other statutes and explicitly defines the term "person" in a manner that transcends the biological.[1]

According to the Interpretation Act 1978, the term "person" includes "a body of persons corporate or unincorporate".[1] This statutory definition confirms that in the eyes of the law, a "person" is a container for rights and duties, not a synonym for a human being. The inclusion of a "body of persons" establishes a duality: there is the natural person, and there is the artificial person created by registration.[1] When a statute imposes an obligation, such as a tax liability or a regulatory duty, on a "person," it applies with equal force to the artificial entity created by the birth registration process.[1]

The birth certificate construct is functionally a statutory trust or a body corporate. Upon the registration of a birth, the state creates a legal personality that is distinct from the child whose birth occasioned its creation.[1] This entity acts as the token used to traverse the board of commerce. The name on the certificate, often stylized in all-capital letters—a practice known as "Glossa"—represents a separate estate or corporate body owned by the state or "the House".[1] The separation between the creator or controller of an entity and the entity itself is the bedrock of corporate law, established in the seminal House of Lords decision in *Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd*.[1]

In *Salomon*, the House of Lords rejected the argument that a company was merely an alias or agent for its founder. Lord Macnaghten held that "the company is at law a different person altogether from the subscribers".[1] This principle, known as the "Corporate Veil," was originally designed to protect the natural person from the liabilities of the artificial person. However, in the context of the birth certificate construct, this veil operates with a perverse inversion.[1] Instead of protecting the human, the system utilizes the separation to create a liability-bearing entity (the Artificial Person) and then, through the law of agency, attaches those liabilities to the living man.[1]

## Table 1: Comparative Jurisdictional Attributes of the Natural vs. Artificial Person

| Feature | Natural Person (Living Man/Woman) | Artificial Person (Birth Certificate Construct) |
|---|---|---|
| **Origin** | Biological / Divine Creation [2] | Statutory Registration [1] |
| **Legal Basis** | Common Law / Natural Law [1] | Statute Law / Admiralty-Equity [1] |
| **Ontological State** | Living, Sentient, Moral Agent [1] | Fictional, "Body of Persons," Decedent Estate [1] |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Function** | Source of Credit Energy / Player [1] | Liability Vessel / Player Piece [1] |
| **Identification** | Proper Name (Mixed Case) [2] | All-Caps "Glossa" Name [1] |
| **Physical Capacity** | Possesses Mind, Body, and Spirit [1] | No Physical Presence; Incapable of Action [1] |
| **Liability Status** | Creditor (Potential) [1] | Debtor (Bankrupt by Default) [1] |

Because an artificial person—whether a corporation, a trust, or a registered estate—has no physical body or mind, it cannot act in the material world. It requires a natural person to act on its behalf to effectuate its will in the physical realm.[1] This necessity creates the Agency Nexus. Every time a living individual interacts with the state or commerce using the name on their birth certificate, they are acting as an agent for that artificial entity.[1] The failure to distinguish between acting as the entity (identification) and acting for the entity (representation) is the root of the "Agency Trap".[1]

# The Agency Nexus and the Mechanism of Presumed Surety

Agency is defined as a consensual relationship whereby one person, the agent, is authorized to act on behalf of another, the principal, and thereby affect the principal's legal position.[1] In the classical formulation provided by Bowstead and Reynolds, agency is a fiduciary relationship requiring the express or implied consent of both the principal and the agent.[1] In the context of the birth certificate construct, the state relies on a "Presumption of Agency" where the living individual is treated as the representative of the registered identity for purposes of enforcement, taxation, and regulation.[1]

The modern administrative state exercises control through the Agency Trap, which binds the biological human to the liabilities of the artificial construct.[1] The trap closes when the living man or woman believes they *are* the artificial person, thereby allowing the state to bypass the corporate veil and access the individual's energy and labour directly.[1] This relationship is often established at birth when parents, acting as informants, register a name that the state subsequently claims as its own property, frequently identified as Crown Copyrighted intellectual property.[1]

When a living individual answers to the name on the birth certificate in court or signs a document without qualification, they are deemed to have consented to the agency relationship through their conduct.[1] They have validated the presumption of agency. Furthermore, the "directing mind and will" doctrine, articulated in *Tesco Supermarkets Ltd v Nattrass*, attributes the mental state of the agent to the corporation.[1] If the

living man acts with *mens rea* (a guilty mind), that state of mind is attributed to the artificial person, justifying the imposition of penalties on the entity—which the man, as the presumed surety, must then pay.[1]

A surety is one who undertakes to pay money or perform other acts in the event that his principal fails to do so.[1] In this triangular relationship, the Artificial Person is the principal debtor, the Living Man is the surety (who mistakenly believes he is the principal), and the State is the creditor.[1] This relationship is sealed in the courtroom; when a judge calls the name of the Artificial Person and the living man stands up and identifies as that name, he has verbally confirmed the agency relationship and volunteered to be the surety for the defendant named on the docket.[1]

## Table 2: The Components of the Agency Trap

| Component | Standard Perception | Legal Reality (The Trap) |
|---|---|---|
| **Principal** | The Human Being | The Birth Certificate Estate [1] |
| **Agent** | Not Applicable | The Living Man / Woman [1] |
| **Surety** | Not Applicable | The Living Man / Woman [1] |
| **Consent** | Assumed by birth | Presumed by conduct and signature [1] |
| **Liability** | Personal responsibility | Presumed surety for the fiction's debts [1] |
| **Authority** | Inherent rights | Apparent authority derived from identification [1] |

The Bills of Exchange Act 1882 provides a critical practical tool for understanding and potentially severing this trap. Section 25 of the Act deals with signatures "by procuration" (*per procurationem* or "p.p."), which operates as notice that the agent has but a limited authority to sign, and the principal is only bound if the agent was acting within their actual authority.[1] By signing "p.p." or as an "Authorized Representative," the individual doctrinally enforces the separation between the natural and artificial persons, preventing the

Agency Trap from closing.[1] However, the vast majority of individuals sign documents without such qualification, thereby accepting unlimited liability as a surety for the construct.[1]

# The Monopoly Board and the Perpetual Bankruptcy of 1933

The global commercial landscape functions as a comprehensive, digital legal grid frequently referred to as the "Monopoly Board".[1] Within this infrastructure, the individual is positioned from birth as a player on a highly structured board governed by strict administrative rules.[1] The "game" is not a chaotic battle for survival but a structured commercial construct devised with genius intelligence, where the Board represents the global commercial jurisdiction owned and controlled by "the House" or the state.[1]

The environment of this commercial Monopoly board is defined by a state of perpetual bankruptcy, a condition that began in 1933 following the suspension of the gold standard.[1] In the United States, this was formalized by House Joint Resolution 192 (HJR 192) on June 5, 1933, which made it unlawful to require payment in gold.[1] HJR 192 declared that obligations requiring payment in gold were against public policy and that all debts could only be "discharged" dollar for dollar in any coin or currency that was legal tender at the time of payment.[1]

The technical implication of this resolution is that there is no "real money" (money of substance) in the system to pay a debt; there are only Federal Reserve Notes or other currency instruments, which are debt instruments or ledger-based credits.[1] Because the government confiscated the gold—the substance with which debts could be paid—it technically became the debtor, and the people, whose private property and "energy" collateralize the national debt, became the creditors.[1] In this state of Chapter 11 bankruptcy, "the House" holds the legal title to all assets, while the players hold only the equitable right to use them.[1]

## Table 3: National "Board" Characteristics and Punitive Metrics

| Nation | Primary Economic Stressor | Jurisdictional Penalty | Statistical Data Point |
|---|---|---|---|
| **United States** | Medical Debt & Healthcare [1] | High Incarceration for Fines [1] | 36% of households fear medical debt.[1] |
| **United Kingdom** | Council Tax & Loan Charge [1] | Psychological Terror (Bailiffs) [1] | £8.3 billion in Council Tax arrears.[1] |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Australia** | Mortgage Stress & Automated Fines [1] | Automatic License Suspension [1] | 30.3% of mortgage holders in stress.[1] |
| **Canada** | Unsecured Debt & Tax Liability [1] | High Consumer Insolvency [1] | 44% of insolvents owe the CRA.[1] |
| **New Zealand** | Direct Bank Account Access [1] | Unannounced Wage Deductions [1] | 13% have overdue tax/entitlement debt.[1] |

The birth certificate construct is made bankrupt by default within this system. It is a decedent estate that is "lost beyond the seas" and administered by the state in a state of insolvency.[1] The "Agency Trap" is the mechanism by which the state drags the living man or woman into this bankruptcy. Because the individual identifies as the bankrupt piece, the liabilities attaching to the artificial estate are enforced against the living individual as the surety.[1] The living player is the source of all "credit energy" (via signatures and labour) that powers every transaction on the board, but the "Agency Trap" allows the state to capture this value to service the national debt.[1]

# The Fiduciary Fallacy: Why the "De Facto Trustee" Claim is Fundamentally Flawed

A prevalent strategy in the status-correction community involves claiming that the living man or woman is a "de facto trustee" of the birth certificate construct. This strategy is fundamentally flawed and represents a "fatal category error" that often leads to increased jurisdictional captivity rather than liberation.[1] By claiming to be a "de facto trustee," the individual inadvertently accepts a subordinate and liable role within the state's jurisdictional framework.

## The Category Error and Validation of the Trust

The primary failure of the "de facto trustee" argument is its failure to recognize the nature of the forum. Statutory courts are designed to adjudicate the administration of commercial agency and statutory trusts.[1] When a defendant declares, "I am a living man, not a person," or claims to be a "de facto trustee," the court views this as an attempt to argue factual reality in a forum of form.[1]

A "de facto trustee" is defined in trust jurisprudence as a person who assumes the office of a trustee under a "colour of right" or title and exercises the duties of the office.[4] A person assumes this position where they assert authority derived from an election or appointment, no matter how irregular that appointment might be.[4] By claiming to be a "de facto trustee," the individual:

1. **Acknowledges the Construct**: They admit the existence and validity of the birth certificate as a trust.
2. **Accepts Fiduciary Duty**: They volunteer for a role that carries strict fiduciary obligations to the beneficiary (the State).[1]
3. **Submits to Statute**: A trustee is bound to administer the trust according to the rules set by the settlor—in this case, the state's statutes.[6]

## The "Belligerent Trustee" Problem

When an individual claims to be a trustee but refuses to execute the duties associated with the role (such as paying taxes or complying with regulations), the court labels them a "Belligerent Trustee".[1] The court, acting for the beneficiary (the state), punishes the trustee for breach of fiduciary duty. This is not a violation of the individual's rights; it is the enforcement of their self-assumed fiduciary obligations as the presumed agent.[1]

Furthermore, anyone who "intermeddles" with a trust or estate without formal appointment may be held liable as a "trustee de son tort" (trustee of his own wrong) or an "executor de son tort".[5] A trustee de son tort is subject to the same rules and remedies as a duly appointed trustee but is typically denied compensation and must carry all the risks and make good all the losses.[5] Claiming "de facto" status provides the court with a "jurisdictional hook" to hold the individual personally liable for the debts of the construct under the guise of fiduciary breach.

## Table 4: Structural Comparison of Capacity - Trustee vs. General Executor

| Feature | De Facto Trustee (Flawed) | General Executor (Envoy Protocol) |
|---|---|---|
| **Jurisdictional Level** | Administrative / Subject [1] | Probate / Master [1] |
| **Authority Source** | "Colour of Right" / Irregularity [4] | Will and Testament / Nunc Pro Tunc [1] |
| **Scope of Power** | Limited by trust terms (Statutes) [6] | Unlimited in time, place, or subject [1] |
| **Relationship to State** | Subordinate Fiduciary [1] | Principal / Chief Administrator [1] |
| **Liability Type** | Personal (Breach of Duty) [1] | Representative (Estate Account) [1] |
| **Legal Justification** | Participation in Trust [4] | Reclaiming "Abandoned" Estate [1] |

The "de facto trustee" strategy fails because it attempts to defeat the system from within its own jurisdiction using its own terminology.[1] Shouting at the Monopoly board while standing on a square as a piece only results in jurisdictional retaliation, such as contempt charges or psychiatric evaluations.[1] To exit the board, one must change their capacity to a role that the state cannot easily subordinate.

# The Doctrine of Executor de son tort and the Intermeddling Trap

The relationship between the living individual and the birth certificate estate is further illuminated by the doctrine of *executor de son tort*—the "executor of his own wrong." This refers to a person who, without lawful authority, intermeddles with the goods of a deceased person as if they were the rightful executor.[9] The modern administrative state treats the registered legal person as a decedent estate because the living individual rarely claims the role of "Executor" for the entity.[1]

## The State as Default Administrator

In the absence of a competent living claimant, the state (the Crown) acts as the administrator of these estates.[1] However, the state acts as an *executor de son tort*—filling the vacuum left by the individual's failure to claim their office.[1] The state's primary objective is to assign the liability of this estate to the living individual. This is achieved through the intermeddling trap:

1. **Usage as Intermeddling**: When a living man uses the assets of the estate (the name, a driver's license, a bank account) without asserting a specific legal office (like General Executor), he is "intermeddling" with the estate.[1]
2. **Assumption of Liability**: By acting like the owner or representative of the name without formal title, the individual renders himself liable as *executor de son tort*.[1]
3. **Loss of Protection**: An *executor de son tort* is personally accountable to creditors and beneficiaries for the full value of the intermeddled assets and is typically denied the protections of limited liability that a rightful executor would enjoy.[1]

## The passing off and Identity Fraud Torts

The "Envoy Protocol" notes that using the birth-registered name—which is Crown Copyrighted property—constitutes the tort of "Passing Off" or "Identity Fraud".[1] The individual is representing themselves as state property (the construct) they do not own. Because the state owns the name, it claims all taxes and debts associated with that name as incidents of public administration.[1] When the living man accepts the role of agent or de facto trustee, he is essentially volunteering to pay the state's bills for the state's own property.

To escape this trap, the individual must transition from an "implied agent" or "intermeddler" to the "General Executor" through a formal protocol.[1] The General Executor is the lawful representative of the estate, whose rights relate back to the time of the testator's death (or the creation of the construct).[11] Once the office is occupied, the individual's actions are protective of the estate rather than intermeddling with it.

# The Envoy Protocol: Severing Agency and Reclaiming the Executive Office

The Envoy Protocol is a capacity-based framework designed to "correct the file" by aligning legal capacity with function.[1] It does not "fight" the system but leverages its own rules to achieve an exit from the Monopoly board.[1] This is achieved through two primary technical steps: the severing of presumed agency via *Clausula Rebus Sic Stantibus* and the occupation of the Office of General Executor.

## Clausula Rebus Sic Stantibus (CRSS)

The protocol utilizes the international law principle of *Clausula Rebus Sic Stantibus* ("things thus standing") to break the presumption of agency.[1] The technical argument is that the agency relationship (the birth certificate) was formed when the individual was an infant, without informed consent or capacity.[1] Because the "fundamental circumstances" have changed—the infant is now a competent adult—the individual invokes CRSS to rescind the presumed agency.[1] This declaration ratifies that the tacit agreement for the living man to act as surety is void *ab initio* (from the beginning).[1]

## Occupying the Office of General Executor

Once the presumed agency is severed, the individual must formally occupy the Office of General Executor for the registered decedent estate.[1] A General Executor is defined in legal terms as one whose power is "unlimited as to time, place, or subject matter".[1] This shift in standing moves the individual from being the party responsible for liabilities (the agent/surety) to the party with the highest authority to administer the estate (the principal/creditor).[1]

As General Executor, the individual:

- **Directs the Estate**: They align their legal capacity to prevent administrative overreach by the state, which is otherwise viewed as unauthorized intermeddling.[1]
- **Enjoys Fiduciary Immunity**: An executor is not personally liable for the debts of the estate provided they act within their authority and do not personally intermeddle.[1]
- **Issues Writs of Prohibition**: They prevent unauthorized public officials (judges, clerks, attorneys) from performing administrative acts regarding the estate.[1] Any such unauthorized acts are categorized as "unauthorized administration" or the actions of an *executor de son tort*.[1]

This protocol provides the "Administrative Shield" necessary to operate within what is claimed to be a superior jurisdiction: probate law.[1] Proponents argue that probate jurisdiction is the highest form of law, superior to administrative, equity, and supreme courts, because it deals with the final settlement of the accounts of the construct.[1]

# Commercial Mechanics and the Asset Fortress Protocol

Status correction alone is insufficient without a mechanism to manage the commercial reality of the "Artificial You's" debts and assets. The "Asset Fortress Protocol" (AFP) is the technical mechanism for severing the state's link to property and establishing a private treasury.[1]

## Severing the Link to State Ownership

The "Fallacy of Ownership" dictates that individuals do not "own" assets registered to their Legal Person; the state holds the Legal Title as security for the national debt.[1] The AFP solves this by transferring assets (houses, cars, businesses) into a private fiduciary trust or entity (such as a 98-series Foreign Grantor Trust).[1]

1. **Transfer of Claims**: Assets are legally moved from the bankrupt "Artificial You" to the AFP.[1]
2. **Separation of Liability**: The living man operates as the beneficiary of the trust, enjoying the use of the assets without the personal liability attached to the state-owned construct.[1]
3. **Jurisdictional Firewall**: By moving assets across the jurisdictional barrier into a private trust, they are shielded from the liens and levies that accrue to the Artificial Person in the public jurisdiction.[1]

## Table 5: Commercial Instruments of the Advanced Strategy

| Instrument | Standard Commercial Purpose | Advanced Monopoly Function |
|---|---|---|
| **Birth Certificate** | Record of Vital Statistics | Security / Warehouse Receipt for Estate [1] |
| **Federal Reserve Note** | Currency for Payment | Debt Instrument for Discharge [1] |
| **IRS Form 1099-OID** | Report Bond Interest Income | Recoup "Abandoned Credit" from Treasury [1] |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **UCC § 8-105 Notice** | Notice of Adverse Claim | Attack Bank's Standing as a Nominee [1] |
| **IRS Form 508(c)(1)(a)** | Non-Profit Exception | Convert Business into a Private Ministry [1] |

### The Currency Creation Protocol and Credit Recoupment

The strategy relies on identifying banks and tax offices as "presumed nominees"—middlemen who have captured the credit generated by the living man's "energy" (signatures) but failed to credit his account.[1] Every time an individual signs a mortgage or loan application, they provide the "credit energy" that powers the transaction.[1]

- **Recoupment**: Using IRS Form 1099-OID (Original Issue Discount), the individual identifies the interest and taxes paid on mortgages and loans as "abandoned credit" belonging to the living man.[1]
- **Discharge**: The recouped credit is redirected from the Treasury back to the private Asset Fortress, where it is used to discharge the debts of the original birth certificate construct.[1]
- **Infinite Prosperity Cycle**: In a debt-based system, every spend creates new credit. By spending from the private treasury as the "Holder in Due Course," the player effectively turns every expenditure into a new credit creation event.[1]

## Conclusion: The Transition from Debtor Pawn to Master of the Board

The analysis of the relationship between the living man/woman and the birth certificate construct reveals that the fundamental cause of commercial failure and legal defeat is a misalignment of capacity.[1] The state's "Agency Trap" relies entirely on the individual's failure to distinguish themselves from the bankrupt artificial piece. By mistakenly identifying as the construct—or worse, by claiming the subordinate role of a "de facto trustee"—the individual validates the state's jurisdiction and assumes personal liability for the debts of a state-owned estate.[1]

The "de facto trustee" strategy is fundamentally flawed because it operates within the state's own jurisdictional framework, accepting the trust's validity and the individual's subordinate status. It invites the court to enforce fiduciary duties on the human being, often resulting in charges of breach of duty or unauthorized intermeddling.[1]

The path to commercial immunity and jurisdictional autonomy lies not in the rejection of the legal persona but in the mastery of its administration through the Envoy and Asset Fortress Protocols.[1] By severing the

presumed agency via *Clausula Rebus Sic Stantibus*, occupying the Office of General Executor, and utilizing the orthodox protections of separate legal personality and limited signature authority (*per procurationem*), the living individual transitions from a debtor pawn to a solvent creditor.[1] This technical approach shifts the battlefield to probate jurisdiction, where the individual acts as the principal and master of the board, ensuring that while the debt and liability remain with the fictional construct, the living man is free to live.[1]

ECCLESIA LAW

**Works cited**


1. THE BIGGEST SECRET PLAYING MONOPOLY TO WIN .pdf
2. Notice - Tax Policy Associates, accessed on April 14, 2026, https://taxpolicy.org.uk/wp-content/assets/stamp_claim_26_11_2024_REDACTED.pdf
3. NOTICE WRIT - Tax Policy Associates, accessed on April 14, 2026, https://taxpolicy.org.uk/wp-content/assets/10.07.2024-openDemocracy-Unauthorised-Administration-Writ-of-Prohibition-NOTICE-New.pdf
4. De Facto Trustee Doctrine Recognized | Adrian Philip Thomas, P.A., accessed on April 14, 2026, https://www.florida-probate-lawyer.com/blog/2009/january/de-facto-trustee-doctrine-recognized/
5. De Facto Trust: Claiming to be a Trustee - The Grossman Law Firm, accessed on April 14, 2026, https://www.grossmanlaw.net/de-facto-trust/
6. Grant of Probate - Page 3 of 3 - Irish Legal Guide, accessed on April 14, 2026, https://legalguide.ie/grant-of-probate/3/
7. Third-party liability for knowingly participating in a breach of trust | JD Supra, accessed on April 14, 2026, https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/third-party-liability-for-knowingly-part-84942/
8. EXECUTOR - Law Dictionary of Legal Terminology, accessed on April 14, 2026, https://www.law-dictionary.org/definitions-e/executor
9. MANN v. BUFORD (2003) | FindLaw, accessed on April 14, 2026, https://caselaw.findlaw.com/court/ms-supreme-court/1439514.html
10. Wills+Gordon_Klaray.docx - AWS, accessed on April 14, 2026, https://cans.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/CANS+2019-2020/Wills+Gordon_Klaray.docx
11. R v Naupoto - Tongan Legislation, accessed on April 14, 2026, https://ago.gov.to/cms/ago-materials/publications/tonga-law-reports.html?download=1558:2008_tlr
12. 2011-2012 Bill 1243: S.C. Probate Code - South Carolina Legislature Online, accessed on April 14, 2026, https://www.scstatehouse.gov/sess119_2011-2012/bills/1243.htm